

REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed July 28, 2006, has been received and reviewed. As of the July 28, 2006 Office Action, Claims 1-14 were pending and presently stand rejected. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 7, 11 and 14. As of this SECOND AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE, Claims 1-14 are believed to be in condition for allowance and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application as amended herein.

Examiner Interview

An Examiner Interview was conducted on September 20, 2006, to discuss the amendments proposed herein. No agreement was reached during the interview. However, Examiner Murphy suggested that further support for the proposed amendments be provided in the formal submission. Such support for the amendments is included herewith and detailed below.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections

M.P.E.P. 706.02(j) sets forth the standard for a Section 103(a) rejection:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 4,996,709 to Heep et al.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heep et al. Heep et al. appears to disclose an intercom telephone that transmits voice signals on two or more frequency modulated (FM) channels over a wire

pair of a local telephone network. [Abstract.] However, Heep et al. does not appear to allow transmission of unmodulated media network signals. Specifically, FIG. 2 of Heep et al. clearly shows that all voice (media) signals are modulated during transmission and demodulated during reception. [See modulators 14-16 and demodulators 34-36.]

Accordingly, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 7, 11 and 14 to more clearly distinguish over the Heep et al. reference. More specifically, currently amended Claims 1 and 7 now recite the limitation "a media transceiver configured for sending and receiving unmodulated media signals," added limitation underlined. Similarly, currently amended Claim 11 now recites the limitation "each digital media network station configured for wall mounting and in communication with each other over an unmodulated media network bus," added limitation underlined. Finally, currently amended Claim 14 now recites the limitation "said one of said at least three media network stations transmitting unmodulated media signals to all other of said at least three media network stations if said media bus is not being used," added limitation underlined. Claims 2-5, 6-10 and 12-13 depend from the above amended independent Claims 1, 7, 11 and 14.

Support for the negative limitation that has been added to independent Claims 1, 7, 11 and 14 may be found in FIG. 1 and paragraph [0017], specifically, "Audio transmitter 108 may be any suitable electronic device for receiving an audio signal from an audio device and transmitting the audio signal over an audio bus. Similarly, audio receiver 110 may be any suitable electronic device for receiving an audio signal from an audio bus and outputting the audio signal to a suitable audio output device." Note that there is no mention of modulating/demodulating the audio (media) signal prior to transmitting and after receiving. Thus, the raw media signal is transmitted over the media bus 120. Note also that FIG. 1 of the present application does not illustrate modulators or demodulators for transmission of the media signals. Additionally, support may be found in paragraph [0019], specifically "the digital media network station 100 described above is particularly suited to distribution of compact disc quality audio over a digital media bus 120". Thus, the media bus 120 may be used for streaming media

signals without modulation. This is in particular contrast to the FM modulation required in the Heep et al. reference.

For these reasons, Claims 1-14 are nonobvious over Heep et al. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the obviousness rejection based on Heep et al.

Entry of the Amendments

The amendments to Claims 1, 7, 11 and 14 above should be entered by the Examiner because the amendments are inherently supported by the as-filed specification and drawings and do not add any new matter to the application.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-14 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee or to credit any overpayment in connection with this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 50-0881.

Respectfully Submitted,



Paul C. Oestreich
Registration Number 44,983
Attorney for Applicant
MORRISS O'BRYANT COMPAGNI, P.C.
136 South Main Street, Suite 700
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
(801) 478-0071 Telephone
(801) 478-0071 Facsimile

PCO/stba1